

62558

FAA-99-5926-26

Subj: **FAA Docket No. FAA-99-6926 Airspace Utilization**
Date: 0812811999 9:24:08 AM Eastern Daylight Time
From: DFaile
To: 9-npm-cmts@faa.gov, REP.SHAYS@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV
BCC: DFaile, bdavis@eaa.org, sen_dodd@dodd.senate.gov
BCC: senator-leiberman@lieberman.senate.gov

ORIGINAL

Dear Sir:

I am a Certificated Flight Instructor (currently Flight Instructor of the Year for the US). I **have** been a pilot for **over** forty years and a Certificated Flight Instructor for more than thirty-four years. I currently earn my living doing flight instruction and teaching aviation safety.

I am apposed to you expansion of the ability of the FAA to make more airspace restricted to flight by the pilots of the United States.

U.S. Department of Transportation Dockets
Docket No. FAA-99-5926
400 Seventh Street, SW.
Washington DC, 20590

SUBJECT Docket No. FAA-99-5926, Modification of the Dimensions of the Grand Canyon National Park Special Rules Area and Free Flight Zones

- * Extending Special Rules Area and Flight-Free Zones outside of the current scope sets a dangerous precedent. The National Park Service may then use mitigation agreements to "give away" federally protected airspace anywhere in the country.
- * An attempt to raise the upper limit of the park's Special Rules Area from 14,500 feet MSL to 18,000 feet MSL is proposed with no evidence that any noise impact exists.
- * The proposed southeastern border of the Special Rules Area would effectively eliminate all eastbound VFR routes and create a safety hazard with an adjoining military operations area.
- * The expanded northern and western boundaries of the Special Rules Area are unnecessary, as no evidence of noise issues has been presented.
- * The two established VFR transition corridors for use by general aviation pilots flying through the area should be maintained. In addition, non-commercial general **aviation** aircraft should be allowed to overfly the proposed Flight Free Zones at altitudes above 10,499 feet MSL.

I am concerned that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the National Park **Service** (NPS) **have** made no effort to determine the effect, if any, general aviation is having on the GCNP and it's neighbors. The noise impact from commercial air tours is the only aviation activity addressed in this study.

The FAA and the NPS have failed to present any evidence that indicated the need to restrict general aviation aircraft from flying in the vicinity of or **over** the GCNP. There is no evidence that general aviation

SEP 1 1999
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DOCKET SECTION
99 SEP -1 PM 2:46

has contributed to the loss of natural quiet within the GCNP. Therefore, I feel it is irresponsible for any **government** agency, especially the FAA, to restrict free passage of general **aviation** aircraft within the National Airspace System without showing due cause for such a restriction. Neither the National Park **Service** nor the Federal Aviation Administration has shown just cause for **effectively** banning general **aviation** from overflying the park.

I propose the following changes to the proposed rule:

93.305 Flight-free Zones and Flight Corridors.

Desert View Flight Free Zone

I strongly oppose extending the Desert View FFZ outside the boundaries of the GCNP solely for the purpose of reaching a mitigation agreement with the Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP).

Reason: The purpose of Public Law 100-91 is to **provide** a means to restore the natural quiet within the GCNP. It was not intended to be used as a bargaining tool by the NPS in reaching agreements with its neighbors.

I strongly disagree with the FAA and the NPS in extending this mandate as a **leveraging** tool to meet mitigation agreements concerning impacts on TCP. Extending the SFRA and the **FFZs** outside of the intended scope of the 1987 Public Law 100-91 (e.g., outside the GCNP) sets a **very** dangerous precedent. Will future NPS mitigation agreements (USA wide) **involve giving** special airspace protection to any Federal, Public, or **Private** group? Once set, this NPS precedent of rewarding mitigation agreement signers with Federally protected airspace could **have** a **devastating** effect on the NAS.

93.301 Applicability

Reduce the proposed ceiling of the airspace from "up to but not including 18,000 feet MSL," to "up to but not including 14,500 feet MSL."

Reason: It appears the FAA and the NPS are attempting to circumnavigate all the public and inter-agency agreements made during the 1996 GCNP SFRA public and congressional meetings.

In 1996, the FAA and the NPS proposed the upper limit of the GCNP SFRA be increased from 14,500' MSL to "up to but not including 18,000' **MSL**". Public and Congressional meetings determined the requested increase placed an unnecessary burden on the public and per agreement, the upper altitude was left unchanged at 14,500' MSL. In the 1999 Federal Register document, the FAA and the NPS are again trying to raise the upper limit to "up to but not including 18,000' MSL." As in 1996, not one shred of **evidence** has been presented to justify the increase in altitude. Further, the environmental assessment did not address the noise impact, if any, of aircraft operating at these altitudes **above** the park.

The upper limit of the GCNP SFRA needs to remain 14,500' MSL.

I recommend the following adjustment to the Southeastern border of the GCNP SFRA:

Lat. 35°57'00" N., Long. 112°03'30" W.; East to Lat. 36°00'24" N., Long. 111°39'34" W.; North to Lat. 36°12'35" N., Long. 111°39'33" W.; Northwest to Lat. 36°24'49" N., Long. 111°47'45" W.

Reason: The proposed Southeastern border of the GCNP SFRA, Southern point of Lat. 35°55'38" N., Long. 111°36'03" W., **effectively** eliminates all Eastern VFR routes around the GCNP. By placing this point one nautical mile (nm) from the Sunny Military Operations Area (MOA) border, the proposal **effectively** places a road block in the sky, making it impossible to fly from any airport South or West of the GCNP to Tuba City Airport (T03) or any points to the East or Northeast. If adopted, this roadblock will force VFR pilots to deviate up to 300 nm in order to fly around the GCNP to the West and North. This action will result in a greater environmental impact (fuel burned, aircraft noise) to those areas under these newly forced VFR flight routes.

The Sunny MOA is a **very active** military jet fighter training area used by F16, F15, and F18 aircraft for basic fighter maneuver (BFM) training, fighter intercept training, fighter transition training and fighter formation flight training. With these fighters operating at a maximum airspeed just short of the speed of sound, no reasonable VFR pilot flying a small aircraft will enter the Sunny MOA hoping that they will be able to "see and **avoid**" these fighters in time to **avoid** a mid-air collision. Thus it is not reasonable for the FAA and the NPS to force slow flying VFR pilots into this "hornets" nest.

The GCNP SFRA was established to reduce the impact of aircraft noise on the GCNP park **environment**, not to provide a "protected zone" for commercial air tour operators to fly in. The proposed **movement** of the Desert View FFZ 5 nm to the

East of the GCNP border has that effect. Therefore, extending the GCNP SFRA an additional 4 nm beyond the proposed Desert View FFZ solely to provide a flight corridor for commercial air tour operators is an unnecessary infringement on the

limited National Airspace **available** for public use. Commercial air tour operators may operate freely outside the GCNP SFRA per CFR 14 Parts 91, 121, and 135.

93.301 Applicability

I recommend the following adjustment to the Northern border of the GCNP SFRA:

Lat. 36°48'00" N., Long. 111°35'30" W.; West to Lat. 36°49'00" N., Long. 111°40'15" W.

Reason: These coordinates would be the new Northern geographic or limit of the GCNP SFRA. Neither the 1996 nor the 1999 GCNP SFRA **environmental** assessment **have** shown a need to include areas North of this line in the GCNP SFRA. All references to aircraft noise and other **environmental** issues clearly indicate the area North of this line does not need the "restoring natural quiet" protection offered by the GCNP SFRA per

Public Law 100-91. This line matches the Northern boundary of the GCNP.

93.301 Applicability

I recommend the following adjustment to the Western border of the GCNP SFRA:

Eliminate the proposed expansion in the vicinity of the Grand Canyon West (1G4) airport.

Reason: Extending the GCNP SFRA along "Lat. 36°06'24" N., Long. 113°58'46" , thence south along the boundary of the GCNP to Lat. 36°00'23" N., Long. 113°54'11" W." will **have** no effect on improving the natural quiet within the GCNP. The proposed area was not included in the 1996 GCNP SFRA rule and the 1999 GCNP SFRA environmental assessment clearly indicates this area does not **have** a noise issue. Including this area solely because it lies within the GCNP does not meet the mandate of Public Law 100-91. The FAA and the NPS need to **prove** this area is "endangered" due to encroachment of noise. Their **environmental** assessment study does just the opposite, it **proves** there is no noise issue, therefore this area does not need the protection offered by the GCNP SFRA.

93.305 Flight-free Zones and Flight Corridors.

(a) Establishment of General **Aviation** VFR Transition Corridors.

I recommend the FAA and the NPS maintain the two established VFR transition corridors for use by general **aviation** pilots flying through the area.

Reason: The preamble of the 1996 rule states "the **legislative** history of Pub. L. 100-91 indicates that it was not the intent of the legislation to ban aircraft from **overflying** the Grand Canyon."

Special Use Airspace (SUA) is designed per CFR 14 Part 73. One of the main design features is the ability to return SUA to the public domain when not being used for its intended purpose. It was **never** designed to create a permanent roadblock in the sky. This is not the case with the GCNP SFRA. It provides no relief to general **aviation** (GA) pilots who need to transition through the area.

I agree with the FAA comments in Docket No. 99-5927; Notice No. 99-12, Commercial Air Tour Limitation in the Grand Canyon National Park Special Flight Rules Area which state: "General aviation traffic accounts for about 3 percent of all aircraft traffic in the GCNP according to the Las Vegas FSDO. The FAA does not **believe** that this amount of noise would effect the accuracy of its estimates, as such GA noise has not been measured or included in the noise models used to obtain the estimates contained in this analysis because the FAA **believes** the amount of noise produced by these aircraft is **very** small compared to that of commercial air tour aircraft."

I feel it would be in the public interest for VFR corridors to be reestablished for general aviation aircraft to transition through the GCNP SFRA. VFR transition routes currently exist under CFR 14 Part 93.305 (e.g., Zuni Point Corridor and Dragon Corridor). I strongly recommend these routes

be incorporated into the proposed 93.305.

The redesign of the Desert View FFZ, the Bright Angel FFZ, and the Toroweap/Shinumo FFZ mandates that the entry/exit points for the Zuni Point Corridor and the Dragon Corridor be reestablished. This has not been accomplished in either Federal Register documents: Docket No. FAA-99-5926 and Docket No. FAA-99-5927.

(b) In addition, I recommend the establishment of an East - West corridor for use by VFR transient and general aviation flight operations. This corridor, designated as "Flightstar Corridor", shall be four (4) nm wide either side of a line extending between Pearce Ferry Airport (L25) located at Lat. **36°05'59" N.**, Long. **114°02'59" W.** and the Grand Canyon VOR-DME (GCN) located at Lat. **35°57'14" N.**, Long. **112°08'18" W.**, at or **above** 10,500' MSL.

Reason: **The** establishment of this VFR East - West corridor will reduce the impact the GCNP SFRA imposes on general aviation aircraft per "the **legislative** history of Pub. L. 100-91 indicates that it was not the intent of the legislation to ban aircraft from **overflying** the Grand Canyon." This corridor will also **provide** a direct link for transitioning through the Zuni Point Corridor and the Dragon Corridor.

The request to establish an East -West corridor is supported by FAA statements in Federal Register Docket No. FAA-99-5927. Quote: "General aviation (GA) traffic accounts for about 3 percent of all aircraft traffic in the GCNP according to the Las Vegas FSDO. The FAA does not **believe** that this amount of noise would effect the accuracy of its estimates. This noise has not been measured or included in the noise models used to obtain the estimates contained in this analysis because the FAA **believes** the amount of noise produced by these aircraft is **very** small compared to that of commercial air tour aircraft."

93.305 Flight-free Zones and Flight Corridors.

I recommend changing the rule to allow noncommercial general aviation aircraft to **overfly** the proposed GCNP **FFZ's** at altitudes **above** 10,499 feet MSL. This altitude will **give** adequate terrain and tour operation clearance, would maintain a 3,000 AGL clearance that is desired in the Environmental Assessment to **prevent** conflicts with birds, and should not **have** a significant impact on the natural quiet of the park.

Reason: The establishment of this FFZ **overflight** rule will reduce the impact the GCNP SFRA imposes on general aviation aircraft per "the **legislative** history of Pub. L. 100-91 indicates that it was not the intent of the legislation to ban aircraft from **overflying** the Grand Canyon." This corridor will also provide a direct link for transitioning through the Zuni Point Corridor and the Dragon Corridor.

The request to establish an **overflight** procedure is supported by FAA statements in Federal Register Docket No. FAA-99-5927. Quote: "General aviation (GA) traffic accounts for about 3 percent of all aircraft traffic in the GCNP according to the Las Vegas FSDO. The FAA does not **believe** that this amount of noise would effect the accuracy of its estimates. This noise has not been measured or included in the noise models used to obtain the estimates contained in this analysis because the FAA **believes** the amount of noise produced by these aircraft is **very** small compared to that of

commercial air tour aircraft.”

In closing, expanding the SFRA and **FFZs** beyond the scope and intent of the 1987 Public Law 100-91 is a step in the wrong direction and clearly not in the best interest of providing free **movement** of general **aviation** aircraft **over** public lands. Please assure me and those pilots that I train that you are interested in this industry that **provides** millions of jobs and billions of dollars of **revenue**.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David Faile', written in a cursive style.

David Faile
40 Cider Mill, Fairfield, CT 06430

Flight Instructor of the Year - US
MCFII A&P
FAA **Aviation** Safety Counselor
EAA Technical Counselor and Flight Advisor